SOME NEW BOOKS.

Japan.

The new volume in the "Story of the Nation" series, now publishing by the Putnams, is devoted to Japan. The author, Dr. DAVID MURRAY, was formerly, it seems, adviser to the Japanese Minister of Education, and it is strange, therefore, that we should look in vain to his book for an adequate account of the present educational system. It would also have enhanced signally the usefulness of the work had an appendix reproduced the Constitution promulgated in 1889. We miss this document the more because, owing to the date at which it was put forth, it is not to be found in the principal encyclopædias. Neither has the author taken the trouble to give a summary of its provisions. In the absence of such information it is difficult to understand the political crisis which has lately taken place in Japan. If we had the organic law before us we could comprehend the significance of the incident at a glance, because we should know whether the Japanese Government is of the presidential or of the parliamentary type. One might affirm, indeed, on *a priori* grounds, that, to a people destitute of political experience, the presidential type would be far more suitable than that which is based on ministerial accountability to the popular branch of the Legislature. Of these deficiencies in the book we have a right to complain, but the author's failure to give us an intelligible idea of Shintoism is not his fault. Nobody has yet succeeded in enabling us to understand how the name of religion can be applied to a régime which embodies neither a creed nor a moral code.

The parts of Dr. Murray's volume which will be read with most satisfaction are those which discuss the ethnology of Japan, the introduction of Buddhism and of Chinese culture, and the feudal system which existed in a more or less definite form from the earliest historical times down to its suppression in our own day.

I.

The Ainos now found in Yezo and Saghalien are, according to the belief shared by the most trustworthy ethnologists, representatives of the original occupants of northern and central portions of the main island, otherwise known as Niphon. Their contribution to the ancestry of the present Japanese people is not great, but still sensible, and is thought to explain the personal peculiarities which are found in the inhabitants of those regions. It is supposed that the Ainos came originally from the Asiatic continent by way of the Kurile Islands, or by the island of Saghalien. They belong to the northern group of Mongolians who inhabit the regions about Kamtschatka and adjacent parts of Siberia. The Ainos were not the only prehistoric inhabitants of Japan. There is proof of the existence of another savage race which, at an early date, seems to have been found in many parts of the main island, and, at a later date, in Yezo. These are the so-called pit dwellers, to whom reference is found in the very earliest writings of the Japanese. They dug pits in the earth and built over them a roof, and used these cellars as rooms in which to sleep. As the Japanese invaders went on with the conquest of the central parts of the main island they had many conflicts with these pit dwellers, but ultimately the latter seem to have been driven northward by the more powerful Ainos, and they have now almost disappeared. There is apparently no trace of them in the present Japanese stock.

The twofold character of the existing Japanese race, although it owes something to admixture with the Ainos, may best be explained by two extensive migrations from the continent. The first of these migrations seems to have taken place from Corea, the invaders landing on the main island, in the province of Izumo. This hypothesis accounts for the mythological legends which, in the early Japanese legends, clustered to a great extent around Izumo. It also enables us to understand how it was that, when long afterward the personage known as Jimmu Tenno led his expedition from the island of Kyushu, he found on the main island inhabitants who in all essential particulars resembled his own followers, and with whom, accordingly, he formed alliances. These first emigrants from Corea seem to have belonged to a ruder tribe of the Mongolian race, which have given rise to the more robust and muscular element in the Japanese population. The second body of emigrants from Corea took apparently the same route, and landed on the island of Kyushu. These invaders, in all likelihood, arrived long after the first, and manifestly came from a more cultured tribe of the Mongolian race. The ease with which these migrations could be made will be clear when we recall the fact that the strait between Corea and Japan is only 125 miles wide, and is divided by the island of Tshushima, lying about half way between. These ethnological conclusions rest mainly on the authority of the German scholar, Dr. Baelz, whose measurements of the height of the Japanese are also reproduced in the book before us. It seems that the average height of the males among the Japanese, as obtained by the measurements of skeletons, verified by measurements of living specimens, is 5.02 feet, the range being from 4.76 feet to 5.44 feet. The average height of the females measured was 4.66 feet, and they ranged from 4.46 feet to 4.92 feet. Referring to the skulls measured by him, Dr. Baelz said that relatively they are large, as is always the case among people of small size.

II.

With regard to all the elements of civilization, the Japanese have been, from the beginning of their history, a receptive people. The art of writing and printing was introduced from China in A. D. 284, from which time a knowledge of the Chinese language and literature slowly spread, and scholars were attached to the Government for the purpose of making a written record of events. But the condition of the people was too primitive to make the study of the philosophical and political writings of Confucius and Mencius an essential part of education. Such culture as Buddhism brought with it, accompanied by a knowledge of the writing and the reading of the Chinese letters, was all that obtained extensive currency during the disturbed and warlike ages of Japanese history. It was in A. D. 552 that an ambassador from a province of Corea presented to the Emperor some books explaining Buddhism, but the principal founder and promoter of the Buddhist religion in Japan was Shotoku Taishi, the chief administrator of the government from 572 to 622. According to a census made at this period, there were already 46 Buddhist temples, and 1,385 priests and nuns. The freer intercourse with China and Corea which followed the introduction of Buddhism brought with it not only a stimulus to the study of Chinese literature, but many improvements in the arts and industries. The first school in Japan dates from 668-671, and about thirty years afterward a university was organized. It was not, however, until internal peace was definitely established by Ieyasu, the founder of the last or Tokugawa line of Shoguns that learning took a great start. As the only idea which the Japanese possessed of learning was that which prevailed in China, and was embodied in the Chinese writings, they naturally turned to them for ideas and for systematic training. Ieyasu caused the Confucian books to be printed—this is said to be the first time they had ever been printed in Japan—and these, together with other Chinese classics, were made the essentials of the education of a samurai. The movement was seriously hampered by the impracticable nature of the Chinese written language, which, as it is well known, consists not of a few characters representing sounds and constituting an alphabet, but of thousands of symbols, each representing an idea. A pupil, therefore, has to spend years in learning to make, to read, and to know the mere signs of language. The modern exigencies of Japanese printing require a compositor to handle not less than four thousand or five thousand Chinese characters, besides the Japanese *kana* and other needful marks. The *kana* were the result of a promising effort which was made to simplify the Chinese written language by expressing it in symbols representing sounds. Forty-seven *kana* letters, extended by repetition to fifty—each representing a syllable—are used to express Japanese words. The author does not tell us whether this syllabary is identical with that of the Coreans.

III.

The feudal system can certainly be traced to the time of Yoritomo, who was appointed Shogun in 1192, and undoubtedly the germs of it had long previously existed. It was thoroughly reorganized, however, by Ieyasu, who, in 1603, founded, as we have said, the last dynasty of Shoguns. By this administrator, all daimyos or territorial lords were divided into two classes, the fudai and the tozama. The former term was used to designate those who were considered the vassals of the ruling Tokugawa family. The tozama daimyos were considered equal in rank to the fudai, but were not, in fact, vassals. Of the former there were originally 177, and of the latter 86. The five leading tozama daimyos were designated as guests, and whenever they paid a visit to the capital of the Shogun they were met by envoys and conducted to their residences. Besides those greater lords, Ieyasu established an inferior kind of feudal nobility which was termed Hatomoto (under the flag). These seemed to have numbered about 2,000; they had small holdings assigned to them, and their income varied greatly. It was the custom to employ these minor aristocrats in official functions under the Shogun. Still another class of gentry were the Gokenin, numbering about 5,000, and socially inferior to the Hatomoto. These were mostly employed in subordinate administrative positions. Beneath these were the ordinary fighting men or common samurai, who were the retainers of the daimyos and of the Shoguns. These were descendants of the soldiers of the time of Yoritomo (1192), who appointed shiugo or military governors to reside with a company of troops in each province for the purpose of keeping the peace. Already, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, they had attained a great superiority over the common people, and Ieyasu encouraged them in their superciliousness. Legally the people were divided into four classes, arranged in the following order: Samurai, farmers, artisans, and merchants. In his so-called Legacy (a species of code), Ieyasu expressly declared: "The samurai are masters of the other three classes. Farmers, artisans, and merchants may not behave in a rude manner toward a samurai; a samurai is not to be interfered with in cutting down a fellow who has behaved to him in a manner other than is expected." Again he says: "A girded sword is the living soul of a samurai." During the two and a half centuries of feudalism which followed, the samurai did not fail to use all the privileges which were granted to them by Ieyasu's testamentary law. Especially in the large cities, where great numbers of them were gathered, and where idleness led them into endless evil practices, their arrogance and domineering ways made them an intolerable nuisance. Nevertheless, it is acknowledged by Dr. Murray, and by all other writers on this subject, that nearly all that was good, and high-minded, and scholarly in Japan was to be found among the ranks of these feudal retainers. It is to them that the credit is given for the great changes and improvements which have been initiated since Japan was opened up to foreigners. They were the students who went out into the world to learn what Western science had to teach them. They were the pioneers in a return to a central authority, in the experiment of a representative government, and in the adoption of the principles of freedom and toleration to which the country is now committed. To them Japan owes its ancient as well as its modern system of education. It is not, indeed, pretended that the old stores of literature are due to them, but all the modern development in newspapers, magazines, history, political science, and legal and commercial codes is to be traced to the adaptability and energy of the old samurai class.

The samurai had the privilege of carrying two swords. The principal one (katana) was about four feet long, nearly straight, but slightly curved toward the point, the blade being thick and ground to a keen edge. It was carried in a scabbard thrust through the belt on the left side with the edge uppermost. Besides the katana, the samurai carried a short sword or dagger, about 9½ inches long, called wakizashi. The quality of the Japanese long sword is a matter of national pride, and the feats which have been accomplished by it are almost beyond belief. To cleave at one blow three human bodies laid one upon another, and to cut through a pile of copper coins without nicking the edge were common tests. From these exploits it is manifest that the education of a young samurai must have involved a thorough training in athletic and martial exercises. It appears that the latter part of every school day was allotted to this purpose. The youth was taught to ride a horse, to shoot with the bow, to handle a spear, and especially to be skilled in the etiquette and use of the sword. They went through again and again the details of the commission of hari-kari, so that, when the time for its actual enactment came, they were able to meet the reality without a tremor.

IV.

The most remarkable event in the history of Japan—an event to which the self-sacrifice of a part of the French nobles in the States General of 1789 offers but an imperfect parallel—was the termination of feudalism in 1869 by the voluntary surrender of their feudal rights on the part of the daimyos. This act was doubtless a logical consequence of the restoration of the executive power to the Emperor, but it would have been impossible to bring about by force a centralization of the powers which had been distributed among great territorial lords. It is true that the transfer was facilitated by the fact that, with only a few exceptions, the hereditary princes of the provinces had come to be merely the ostensible rulers of their own domain. The real power had fallen into the hands of capable and energetic samurai, who had been employed to manage affairs. They saw or believed that any scheme for transferring the political authority of the daimyos to the central Government would render their services more important. They would thus become not merely subordinate, administrative functionaries, but the real officers to whom the responsible duties and trusts would be confided. It is to the influence of these men that we must attribute the presentation to the Emperor in 1869 of an elaborate memorial signed by the daimyos of Choshu, Satsuma, Tosa, Hizen, Kaga, and others, offering the lists of their possessions and subjects, and begging the Emperor to resume the grants made by his predecessors. The example thus set by the most powerful and influential princes was followed rapidly by others. Two hundred and forty-one of the daimyos united in asking the Emperor to take back their hereditary territories, and, in the end, there remained only a small number who had not thus petitioned. In reply to these memorials, a decree was issued in August, 1869, announcing the abolition of the daimiates, and the restoration of their revenues to the imperial treasury. It was also decreed that the rank of court nobles and that of daimyos should be abolished and that the single rank designated as Kwazoku should be substituted. Thus, at one stroke, the whole institution of feudalism which had flourished from the time of Yoritomo, the close of the twelfth century, was swept away. The Government made provision for the administration by creating prefectures to take the place of daimiates, and, at first, the daimyos were appointed prefects. But it was soon found that the hereditary princes were, as a class, entirely unfit for high executive offices. Hence other persons were gradually appointed to vacancies until it came to be understood that competence was to be the sole qualification for such posts. The financial questions involved in the suppression of the feudal system were complicated and difficult. It was ultimately decided that each ex-daimyo and each of the feudal lords dependent on him should receive one-tenth of the amount of their previous incomes from their fiefs. The ex-daimyos were to receive this stipend free of any claims upon them for the support of the non-productive samurai who had formed the standing armies of each clan. The central Government assumed all payments due to the samurai for services of any kind. This heavy charge was met by borrowing $165,000,000, which was added to the national debt. With this sum the Government undertook to capitalize the pensions payable to the samurais, and this was finally accomplished by a compulsory enactment.

For many of the feudal retainers this summary settlement had unfortunate results. The lump sums paid were in many cases soon consumed, and the recipients were left penniless and helpless. The traditions under which they had been trained led them to look with disdain upon labor and trade, and rendered them unfit to enter successfully on the careers of modern life. In many cases worry and disappointment, and in others poverty and want, have been the lot of the now obsolete and useless samurai.

Dean Stanley's Life and Letters.

It is more than thirteen years since the death of *Arthur Penrhyn Stanley*, late Dean of Westminster, but it was only about a twelvemonth ago that the materials for writing an adequate life of him were placed in the hands of Mr. ROWLAND E. PROTHERO, the author of the two large volumes which are now published by the Messrs. Scribner. The work has been prepared with the coöperation and sanction of the present Dean of Westminster, Dr. D. D. Bradley, who has contributed an introduction. Two of the three literary executors, who had been selected by Dr. Stanley, died before they were more than able to begin the biographical task to which they had looked forward. The work was then undertaken by Dr. Bradley, who had written a short biographical sketch of his predecessor, and who, in 1886, had contributed an article upon his life to the "Encyclopædia Britannica." The duties of his position, however, proved such as to make it impossible to find the time essential to a task which demanded prolonged and unbroken attention. Dr. Bradley, accordingly, transferred his own recollections of Dr. Stanley, together with all the other materials in his hands, to Mr. Rowland Prothero, and the present biography is the outcome of the latter's labors. The ample scope of the work is due largely to the extensive use made of the subject's letters. Stanley was the most indefatigable of letter writers. As a boy at Rugby, and as an undergraduate at Balliol, he had written letters to his old schoolfellows which were treasured with an instinctive sense of their future value. As years went by, and the circle of his correspondence widened, the habit of letter writing became one of his characteristic traits, and there are probably few persons in the ecclesiastical, social, and literary history of our time about whom have been preserved so many records of his personal feelings and observations. It is true, and Dean Bradley does not fail to recognize the fact, that these impressions so rapidly set down are often marked by hasty and unstudied language, by the strong expressions and exaggerations of which Stanley himself spoke more than once in later life as too frequently recurring in his earlier letters. The biographical value, however of such materials is obviously enhanced by their unpremeditated quality, and by the reader's conviction that the writer could never have expected their eventual publication.

I.

Arthur Penrhyn Stanley was descended from John Stanley, a brother of the first Earl of Derby. John, by his marriage with the heiress of Alderley, founded another branch of the Stanley family, whose representative was created a baronet by Charles II. at the Restoration. The sixth baronet married Margaret Owen, heiress to the estate of Penrhos in Wales, and the eldest son of this marriage, Sir John Thomas Stanley, was raised to the peerage in 1839 as Lord Stanley of Alderley. His only brother was Edward, the future rector of Alderley and Bishop of Norwich, and the father of the subject of this biography, by Catherine, a daughter of the Rev. Oswald Leicester, rector of Stoke. It was in Alderley rectory that the third child of this marriage, Arthur Stanley, was born in December, 1815. He was a boy of an extremely sensitive and nervous organization, in which an excessive shyness alternated with a singular brightness and charm of demeanor. For a long time he seemed to observers outside of his family circle to suffer from an amount of constraint, reserve, and difficulty in expressing his feelings which he never fully overcame until the death of his father and brother forced him to make efforts which were eventually successful. An organization and temperament of this kind scarcely fitted him for the rude life of an English public school. Nevertheless, he was sent to Rugby in January, 1829. Eton and Winchester had both been proposed, but the influence of Augustus Hare, who was about to marry Mrs. Stanley's sister, had turned the scale in favor of Rugby, where Dr. Arnold had been installed as head master in 1828. The new boy was but little more than thirteen, and it is interesting to learn what impression he made on one of his contemporaries at the school. Mr. H. G. Allen recalls that "his general appearance was feminine, and obtained for him the passing nickname of Nancy during the short time before he got into the fifth form. His manners were as gentle as his appearance indicated. He was shy and timid, but full of vivacity when accosted, and it was soon perceived that his attainments and powers rather exceeded than fell short of the report of them which had circulated among us." As a matter of fact, young Stanley was promoted to the fifth form with such rapidity that in six months he had attained to exemption from fagging. It was not to be expected that the biographer could present a great many extracts from the Rugby letters, but he quotes enough to show that they constituted a prolonged series of pictures which owe their freshness and fidelity to the fact that they are not drawn from memory and colored from later experience, but were sketched on the spot. Taken altogether, these letters depict the vain efforts of the writer to throw himself into the ordinary pursuits and amusements of schoolboys, his intense and growing avidity for fresh information and ideas, his shrinking from the coarseness and vice that stain school life, and the reserve and shyness of his sensitive nature, which were yet so combined with a high breeding and a charm of manner and appearance as to save him alike from rough usage and from all imputation of conceit or pedantry. The letters also reveal the writer's early attraction and growing devotion to his teacher, Dr. Thomas Arnold, who, during Stanley's school days, reached the height of his unpopularity in other circles, and who, even at Rugby, was as yet far from having won the affection and reverence which he afterward inspired. They likewise show young Stanley to have been keenly alive to his incapacity for games, which debarred him from the readiest road to influence in the world of a public school, to his helplessness of feet and hands which might naturally provoke the ridicule, if not the horse play, of youthful critics, and to the shyness which isolated him from the companionship of his schoolfellows. His efforts to conquer these shortcomings were only partially successful. Nor were his incapacity for games and his bodily unreadiness counterbalanced in the eyes of his schoolfellows by such a general accessibility and expansiveness of temperament as often secure for a boy a wide share of popularity. In the early part of his Rugby career Stanley was singularly friendless, reserving his confidence for the one or two boys with whom he felt in sympathy. It is from tradition rather than actual observation that his portrait is drawn in "School Days at Rugby," for Stanley was a good deal senior to Thomas Hughes. How little Stanley knew about school life was shown when the book just named came out, for he remarked about it, "It is an absolute revelation to me: opens up a world of which, though so near me, I was utterly ignorant." We add that in spite of Dr. Arnold's personal instruction, mathematics always presented insuperable obstacles to his mind. His incapacity for accounts, his dislike to the abstractions of the exact sciences, his ignorance of architecture and indifference to music were disqualifications to which in later days he was wont, half jocularly, to refer.

II.

Before leaving Rugby, Stanley had won all the six prizes given to the sixth and fifth form, and he also obtained the Balliol scholarship. In October, 1834, he went into residence at Oxford. Here he found himself surrounded by a throng of fresh associates whose society by degrees largely broke down the reserve and shyness which had long kept in check his naturally expansive nature. He had hardly been ten days at Balliol when he sent a friend a description of the five different sets into which his observant eye had already divided the undergraduates of the college. He classified them as "the most disreputable: the idle, though respectable, if such men exist at Balliol; those who read much, but are not overgentlemanly; then a class of literary but rather dull men, who profess not to know classics, second-rate speakers at the Union, but very respectable and gentlemanly; these border on the next and highest class, men who are both clever and gentlemanly, among whom I may mention Cardwell, Tickell, Wiggins, Erskine, Faber, &c." His own outward life soon fell into the ordinary routine of the "reading" undergraduate. He received but little assistance in his work. It is difficult for the undergraduate of to-day, met on every side by an almost superabundance of educational aid, to realize the contrast presented in the days of unreformed Oxford. Stagnant and lifeless, however, as the academical atmosphere then seemed, a time of storm was not far off, destined to shake to its foundations the whole fabric of university life. Day by day young Stanley was brought directly or indirectly into contact with the present or future leaders of the movement, the effect of which on the religious life of Englishmen was to exceed the anticipations of either its champions or its opponents. Under the guidance of Faber, one of his fellow undergraduates, he went to hear Keble lecture, and it was in Faber's rooms that he made the acquaintance of his future friend and companion, William D. Ward, whom he describes as "one of the most candid men in argument I ever saw." More important, however, was the impression made on him by the preaching of J. H. Newman, who had recently returned from the south of Europe to his post as Fellow of Oriel and Vicar of St. Mary's. In a letter written toward the close of 1834, Stanley mentions that he has heard Newman preach two sermons: "As you may suppose, I disagreed, but still, there was the same thorough Christian earnestness in what he said that made him very impressive." In another letter, written about the same time, there is a similar reference to Newman: "There was the same overpowering conviction conveyed that he was a thorough Christian—I had almost said a man of the purest charity. He does appear to be a man of the most self-denying goodness that can well be conceived, and to do good to a very great extent." Visiting Cambridge during his first vacation, he recognized that the lectures were better than those of Oxford, but he expressed an opinion that the Fellows, "with the exception of Wordsworth, were less polished than our Dons." He also thought that the manners of the undergraduates were more barbarous at Cambridge than at Oxford.

Stanley's career at Balliol was remarkably successful. In 1837 he carried off the Ireland Scholarship, and soon afterward obtained the Newdigate prize for a poem on "The Gypsies." Then came the university examination known as "Greats," at which he gained a first-class. He did not secure, however, a Fellowship at Balliol, and it was long before he could reconcile himself to another college. It seems that some of the Fellows of Balliol had determined to oppose Stanley's election, on the ground of his sympathies with the views of Dr. Arnold on the one hand, and with those of Dr. Newman on the other. He accordingly resolved not to expose himself to the possibility of a repulse, and accepted the offer of a Fellowship in University College—we refer, of course, to the institution in Oxford, not to that in London. His election to this Fellowship admitted him to at least the outer circle of those in whose hands were placed the educational and administrative functions of the university. It secured for him also a second home at Oxford, with every prospect of definite work and fixed duties. Though still living on terms of close intimacy with Ward and others of his Balliol friends, he gradually learned to appreciate his new associates. Especially was he interested in the project of university reform, and he seems to have had some share in the composition of the pamphlet on that subject written by A. C. Tait of Balliol. The leading idea put forward by these two future members of the University Commission of 1852 was to encourage students after completing the three years' academical course to reside in Oxford for a fourth year in order to attend professorial lectures. Toward the end of 1839 Stanley was ordained, but it was not without painful hesitation that he subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles, owing to the language used regarding the so-called Creed of Athanasius. It was not the theological statements of the creed that caused him to flinch from accepting it, but the damnatory clauses by which they were accompanied—the sentence "without doubt shall perish everlastingly," pronounced on all who do not subscribe to the minutest definition of the nature and relation of the three persons in the Trinity. The difficulty presented by these damnatory clauses darkened the most momentous period of Stanley's life, nor was its effect ever obliterated by time or by experience. It exercised a marked influence on his views and actions from the day of his ordination down to his latest hour.

III.

Mr. Prothero devotes a chapter to the influence of Oxford on Stanley's character. It was here that he to a large extent shook off his earlier reserve, and even seemed to pass into the opposite extreme from uncompanionable aloofness and to incur the charge of fickleness through his interest in making new acquaintances, and his enjoyment in striking new strata of society. The habit which he acquired of dwelling on the good side of a man and his opinions, his perception of common points in the midst of discord, and his disposition to find merit in all systems, or truth in all propositions, made it almost a mania with him to bring into harmony men of divergent tenets and characters. Thus he became a centre around which gathered men of the most opposite views, who found no other point of contact with one another except their friendship with Stanley. As sympathy, however, was the tie by which he bound to himself so many friends, he had also the *défaut de sa qualité*. Closely allied to his sympathy, and perhaps another phase of it, was his irresolution. The rapidity and keenness with which he saw the cons as well as the pros of any course of action rendered the task of making up his mind both disagreeable and difficult. While engaged in the effort of decision he was miserable. All his days he was painfully aware of the defect. In 1831, when he was only fifteen years of age, he wrote reflections on his irresolution. Once he speaks of having tried to follow Ward's advice to persevere in first intentions, however foolish they might subsequently appear. But he never succeeded in doing this. Toward the end of his career a friend half playfully alluded to the time when his life would be written. A shade passed over Stanley's face, he turned away, and said as he paced the room, "No, my life never will be written. My fatal irresolution will prevent that." The mischievous consequences of this weakness, however, were confined to himself and to those nearest to him, or most dependent on him. For practical work affecting others he threw it off. Once committed to a course of action the course assumed the shape of duty, and henceforth no one could be more persistent, even to the point of stubbornness. It must, at the same time, be noted that the mental conditions to which he owed his power of sympathy and his irresolution, hampered him as a thinker and gave an unscientific turn to his mind. In his imaginative, comprehensive intellect, the fluctuation of motives kept the solution perpetually in abeyance, and there is foundation for the doubt suggested by this biographer, whether the qualities of a poet, which Stanley undoubtedly possessed, are compatible with the gifts indispensable to leaders in sustained speculative thought. On the other hand, the same mental conditions saved him from the intolerance either of orthodoxy or of agnosticism. His tolerance proceeded, not from indifference, but from genuine fellow-feeling.

IV.

All his life Stanley was a great traveller, but it is to be noted that his love of travel was based upon characteristic grounds. This is evident from the numerous records of places visited which are preserved for us in these volumes. For pictures in themselves, or for architecture for its own sake, he had no taste. He was not one of those men who can lie on a hillside and drink in enjoyment; neither could he lounge through a city and simply observe and photograph objectively. External nature seldom seized hold upon him, except as the symbol of some idea, the background of history, or the framework of human interest. It was not that he had no eye for beauty, but he was intent on other things. Scenery, apart from its human associations, and viewed in its own light, possessed little attraction for him. The Alps struck him as "unformed, unmeaning lumps;" confronted by the Matterhorn, he wishes that it were connected with history, with legend, or with worship. On the Lake of Lucerne, he cared only for the spots identified with the story of Tell. The ash trees near Odin's Grove, the possible descendants of the Ygdrasil of Scandinavian mythology, charmed him more than all the lakes and woods of Dalecarlia. No man, on the other hand, ever experienced a more eager delight in seeing places which are connected with famous people, striking events, important legends, or scenes in the works of great masters of poetry or fiction. Where man had set his mark upon a place, there Stanley's interest was keen and his memory unerring. To every historic scene he came with full and exact knowledge of the points of view from which to look and the special features to be noted. He at once detected any departure from faithful representation of such a spot. That tree, he would say, could not have been seen, or that rock was more to the right. The page of history, ancient, modern, or sacred, was always before him, and he bore it with him wherever he journeyed.

It is interesting to learn that, with regard to the relics of antiquity which time has preserved in the respective countries, Stanley gave Greece the palm. He used to say that in Greece the remains are those which a traveller desires most to see; they belong to the period of the acme of her fame; they are the chief glories of her most glorious age. It should be borne in mind, however, that at the time when this opinion was expressed by Stanley, there had, as yet, been unearthed but few memorials connected with the events of the Roman monarchy or republic, and the more complete specimens of Roman architecture belonged to the relatively uninteresting period of the empire. Aside from this fact, nevertheless, there is no doubt that the Greek scenery is steeped in an atmosphere of antiquity which is missed in Italy. The Peloponnesus looks like a land grown old in years as well as glory. Even the outward dress of the hoary thyme and the gray olive seem the natural vesture of a great and ancient country. The dramatic propriety which in Greece such features impress upon the landscape appealed to Stanley more strongly than the riotous prodigality of life in Italian scenery. In Italy he could feel no consciousness, as he had felt in Greece, that he was beholding the exact scene which had met the eyes of Pericles or Plato. The nature of the Italian soil and the genius of the Italian people are opposed to such a continuity. In Attica, on the other hand, the rocky character of the soil fixes the most interesting points with a certainty to which, at Rome, when Stanley saw it, the obscurity that then hung over the position of the forum offered a striking contrast.

V.

It was during 1840-41 that Stanley's tour through Greece and Italy took place. During the next eight years he continued to perform the functions of tutor in University College (he was succeeded in that office by Goldwin Smith), and for a time he discharged the duties of Select Preacher to the university. In 1849 his father, the Bishop of Norwich, died, and, the Dean of Carlisle being appointed to the See of Norwich, the vacant Deanery was immediately offered by Lord John Russell to Stanley. The offer was declined upon the ground that Stanley strongly felt that Oxford was his "natural sphere." But the tie with the university was presently to be loosened. The death of his two elder brothers left him the sole prop of his family, and his succession to a small landed estate rendered it impossible for him, under the regulations then existing, to retain his fellowship. Deprived of his own home at University College, and desirous to provide one for his mother and sisters, he was not likely to refuse another offer of an independent post, even if it severed his connection with Oxford. The offer was not long delayed. But before the autumn of 1851, when he kept his first residence as a Canon of Canterbury, he had important work to do as Secretary to the University Commission. For some time Stanley had been engaged, in conjunction with Jowett and other friends, in preparing a volume of essays on various topics connected with the reform of the university. His views now extended beyond the enlargement of the professorial system, which, in conjunction with Tait, he had advocated eleven years before. He clearly recognized that a university training consists not merely in teaching or in learning, but in a thousand undefined things—in the place, the amusements, the society, the associations—and that it was less a system of education than a particular sphere of English life which might be raised to higher utility by the introduction of more popular and more intellectual elements. Above all, he dreaded that the time for reform might be allowed to slip, and that the consequence of neglecting the right opportunity would be a drastic revolution which would sacrifice much that was of inestimable value. What he desired was to adapt the university to the changes which two centuries had witnessed in the relation of social classes and the subjects of knowledge—to make it a national institution which should not merely train up an intellectual aristocracy, but extend the advantages of its education to all ranks of society. With these objects, he wished to provide endowments for neglected branches of study, to attract poor students by reducing the expenses of college life, to call the university more conspicuously into existence, as distinct from the colleges, and especially to enlarge its foundations by modifying clerical restrictions, by strengthening the professorial staff, and by removing the limitations which confined fellowships and scholarships to particular families or counties. To the Oxford University Commission, which presently came into being, Stanley, as we have said, was appointed secretary, and Goldwin Smith assistant secretary. For nearly two years the work of the Commission absorbed Stanley's energies, and its meetings required his constant presence in London. Gladstone told some one at the time that he thought the Oxford Commission would avoid giving any handle for attack, owing to the ingenuity or ingenuousness of the secretary. It was no doubt that to Stanley's conciliatory tact the Commission owed no small part of its success in dealing with the opposition which was rampant in many of the Oxford colleges. The report of the Commission, which was issued in May, 1852, was a remarkable document, which formed an era in English constitutional history, and furnished a precedent for the course to be followed in dealing with other great national institutions. Most of the changes proposed were eventually effected. Lord Aberdeen's Government in 1854 introduced a sweeping measure of university reform based on the report of the Commission. This measure became a law, and other innovations have since been made on the lines indicated by the Commission. The number of scholars has been increased in each college, and they are selected by a trial of their attainments. The local or hereditary restrictions which confined the choice of 520 out of 542 college fellows to particular localities or families have been removed and the elections purified. The professorial system, whose decay had deprived the university of literary or scientific eminence, has been revived, and supplemented with a staff of lecturers. The course of academic education has been regulated by the institution of boards of studies in each of the different branches. The monopoly of the colleges has been invaded by the permission granted to undergraduates of residing in lodgings, or as unattached students. The obligation to take orders has been removed from all but a few fellowships, and the large intrusion of the lay element has at once moderated the violence of ecclesiastical agitation and counteracted professional narrowness. One most important point, the removal of religious tests for matriculation, was omitted from the recommendations of the Commissioners, but the question is only postponed. No long time elapsed before dissenters of all denominations were admitted to the advantages of a university training and education.

VI.

The publication of the report of the University Commission set Stanley free to pay a visit to the Holy Land, which he had long felt to be of great importance to his future studies, but which his father's death had postponed. Every point in the tour from Alexandria to Constantinople is minutely described in a series of letters which for descriptive vividness and fulness of details can scarcely be surpassed. "Sinai and Palestine," perhaps the most widely popular of his writings, is based on this material. As Goldwin Smith wrote to Stanley on his return, "You have nothing to do but to piece together your letters, cut off their heads and tails, and the book is done." Mr. Prothero does not quote from the letters, the substance of which has already met the public eye, but merely presents a few personal details which were excluded from the published book. Stanley made Egypt his starting point because it was the background of the history of Israel, the inevitable vestibule of "Sinai and Palestine." Without a comprehension of its customs, habits, agricultural practices, and daily occupations, without a vision of its temples and monuments and its narrow strip of verdure hemmed in by sandy wastes, he felt that no impression of the Holy Land would be complete. To saturate his mind with the unchanged aspects of the Nile Valley and of Egyptian life was to prepare for the necessary contrast with the bare, silent, solitary desert. It is to be noted that for Stanley Egypt had no history in the archæological sense of the word. To him, as to the Israelites, its primeval world was the starting point in the gradual unfolding of a great drama which, physically as well as morally, ascended by successive stages, till it culminated at Jerusalem.

It was on a camel that Stanley traversed the Sinaitic desert, and his spirit triumphed over the fatigues which exhausted younger men of more powerful physique. In the desert the one drawback to his complete enjoyment was the uncertainty of the localities. Unable to dogmatize, he would sometimes content himself with a hypothetical decision, occasionally taking refuge in alternatives, and always embarrassed by the consciousness of hesitation. In Palestine this drawback was removed. Henceforward he was in the midst of certainties, passing through places the names of which were the most familiar sounds of childhood. Perhaps no traveller has ever realized more forcibly, or imparted more vividly, the charm of travelling through a classic land. In Palestine he was enabled to transfer with a bold yet reverent hand the whole subject of Biblical archæology to its true place in the science of man. He exhibits in their rich complexity the extraordinary confluence of associations which in magnitude, in antiquity, and in variety are unique. None of the relations of Palestine with ancient or modern history—with Egypt, Assyria, Rome, Arabia, and the West—are overlooked. But if one characteristic of "Sinai and Palestine" is the pictorial skill with which Stanley accumulates the wealth of historical associations, both sacred and profane, another is that approaching the well-worn subject from a new point of view, he shows the general history of the chosen people to be a reflection of the land in which they lived, and traces the special course of particular events to the geographical features of the spots where they occurred. It was Stanley's constant purpose to bring out such minute correspondence between scenes and incidents, such continual and circumstantial agreements of recorded history with natural geography, as should convince the most skeptical that he was dealing, not with fables of Eastern origin, but with realities of flesh and blood.

VII.

Stanley had been made a Canon of Canterbury in 1851, and then, for the first time, exchanged his bachelor rooms at Oxford for a house of his own. He was thus enabled not only to offer a home to his mother and unmarried sister, but to gather guests from all parts of England. It was there that he thoroughly developed the social traits which transformed him into one of the most fascinating of talkers and the most delightful of hosts. Under his roof at Canterbury met in free and social intercourse men of such opposite views and parties that they were accustomed to regard each other as belonging to different worlds. But they met in an atmosphere too congenial for the most acrimonious opponents to resist. In 1858 Stanley was made Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, and two years afterward he was appointed Canon of Christ Church. It was five years later that he left Oxford for the Deanery of Westminster.

It was in accordance with a wish expressed by the Prince Consort just before his death that Dr. Stanley was invited in 1862 to accompany the Prince of Wales on a tour in the East. This journey had important consequences for Stanley, bringing him, as it did, into near relations with the royal family and with the Queen's especial favorite, Lady Augusta Bruce, whom he married in December, 1863, having previously accepted the Deanery of Westminster. Some of his friends felt misgivings at his exchange of an academical office for the wear and tear of social and polemical life in London. But, upon the whole, his acceptance of the deanery was regarded as a great gain to the English Church. There were some vigorous remonstrants, however. Dr. Wordsworth, then Canon of Westminster and afterward Bishop of Lincoln, felt it his duty to preach against Stanley's appointment from the pulpit of the abbey, but the magnanimity of Stanley's reply led eventually to cordial intercourse between the Dean and the Canon. Nevertheless, as Stanley had defended the publication of "Essays and Reviews," such High Church leaders as Keble, Pusey, and Liddon refused to preach at the special services which he arranged to hold in the abbey on Sunday evening. Thus, Stanley's first attempt to use his position as Dean of Westminster for the enlargement of the Church ended in failure. The failure, however, neither shook his conviction that he was right, nor deterred him from renewing the effort. It must, nevertheless, be acknowledged that time only widened the breach. Throughout the whole of his career as Dean of Westminster, he avowed aims and labored for ends which were unpalatable to the religious world at large, and, above all, to the great majority of his clerical brethren. He lived in an atmosphere of contention, which thickened rather than dispersed as years went on. So long, indeed, as Stanley restricted his pursuit of his ideal of a Christian state to social attempts to remove the estrangement which impedes the approaches of rival religious bodies, and which breeds misunderstanding and fosters exasperation, he gave little or no offence to his clerical brethren. If he did not command full sympathy, he did not excite their dread and aversion. But when he endeavored to simplify and universalize Christian theology and the ideas of the Christian Church, and directed his energies toward the removal of the doctrinal or legal barriers to a wider comprehensiveness, the feelings of his brethren underwent a marked change. Nor is it difficult to understand why much that was really positive and conservative in his treatment of religion should have been regarded as purely negative and destructive. When, for example, Stanley vindicated the sanctity of secular life, he was thought by his adversaries to lose sight of the divine in the human, to depreciate the hidden spiritual mystery which the Church embodies in its creeds, and to aim at securing simplicity by the sacrifice of essential complexities. Nor was it only Stanley's wish to draw down theology from heaven to earth which shocked the theological instincts of his clerical brethren. The means by which he pursued his end gave almost equal offence. He applied to theology the methods of historical science and the law of historical development, and thus came into collision with all the conservative instincts which guard the interests of the Christian faith. He believed that no fear of consequences nor inducement of advantages could relieve men from the obligation of free inquiry. No man loved to look facts more directly in the face, or to know the exact and certain truth. This was the quality which most endeared Stanley to that great mass of his contemporaries who never looked upon his face, and it was the same passion for light which was seized upon by Matthew Arnold in his threnody as the most characteristic feature of his friend:

What! for a term so scant
Our shining visitant
Cheered us and now is passed into the night?
Couldst thou no better keep, O Abbey old,
The boon to thy foundation hour foretold,
The presence of that gracious inmate, Light?

M. W. H.

THE NAVY OF FRANCE.

The Criticisms Passed Upon It By M. Lockroy and Its Real Condition.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 3.—It is a little curious that England and France have each had a sensation this winter on the efficiency of their respective navies, and that the critical or alarmist element of each country has been inclined to minimize the estimate of its own strength, and to put at the extreme valuation the possibilities of its neighbor.

In neither case can the undertaking be described as lacking in patriotism, since the object of those who raise the alarm is to secure larger appropriations for the navy, and thus to increase the country's powers of attack and defence. The outcry was raised first in Great Britain, the main point being that France and Russia combined would be stronger in ships than England. The Government resented this statement, but in view of the great amount of ship building authorized for the next few years in those countries, yielded to the urgent demands of the Admiralty, and prepared a tremendous programme of construction, for which the estimates for the next fiscal year are said to be fully $35,000,000. Meanwhile France had been aroused to the condition of her navy, and the Chamber of Deputies had appointed a Commission to inquire into it. The speech of M. Edouard Lockroy, the other day, was the outcome of the inquiry of this Commission, of which he was a member.

The parallel already noted extends to ex-Minister Lockroy's assertions relating to the defencelessness of France, and to defects in the planning or the construction of vessels, both of which points had been made by British critics in regard to their own navy. He holds that the French ironclads are faulty; that there is disorder throughout the naval administration; that Corsica is unprotected, and that Italy could land 15,000 men upon it in an hour's time; that Rouen and Boulogne are practically defenceless, Havre and Dieppe at the mercy of any fleet that chose to bombard them, and so on.

It is a little curious that some English critics, instead of feeling a pardonable pleasure in this revelation of the supposed deficiencies of their neighbor, seem inclined rather to break the force of M. Lockroy's statements. They point out that one French shipbuilding company that devotes itself to fast commerce destroyers and torpedo boats has people in the French Chamber looking out for its interests, and urging the need of constructing more of the cruisers and torpedo craft of which this company makes a specialty, instead of laying out money on heavy battle ships built in Government yards. M. Lockroy declared some time ago that England's navy was twice as large as that of France, and that the disparity could easily be increased, because it costs so much less to build British than French war ships. The Brennus, of 11,000 tons, for example, cost for hull and machinery $4,400,000, and the British ship Centurion, of 10,500 tons, only $2,780,000; the Charnier, too, of a different type, will cost, when ready, $1,792,000, and the British vessel Astrea only $1,198,000. But in all this some of the English critics see, as also in M. Lockroy's criticism of shortcomings in armor-clads, a desire to help the private shipyard against the Government yards. They insist that he underrates the good qualities of the big French battle ships; but they also have a source of anxiety inspiring their own criticisms, namely, lest the naval authorities at Whitehall, and also the Government and Parliament, should be induced to relax their efforts to build up the British navy through these exposures of French shortcomings.

It may fairly be said that some of our own experts have a high opinion of French naval instruction, as being in the forefront of modern progress, and this applies to the work going on at the five great Government arsenals and shipyards at Cherbourg, Brest, L'Orient, Rochefort, and Toulon, as well as to the construction at the La Seyne, Bordeaux, Havre, St. Nazaire, and other private yards.

The reply, also, of Admiral Lefèvre, Minister of Marine, to M. Lockroy's criticisms indicates that the French navy is not so inefficient as the latter insists. M. Lockroy's assertion had been that while France had, since the war of 1871, laid out $200,000,000 more on her navy than had Austria, Germany, and Italy on theirs, she had only increased her naval strength six per cent., while Germany had increased hers sixfold, and even Austria hers two-thirds. But in such statistics, which, by the way, Admiral Lefèvre opposed by others far different as to the expenditures of the nations composing the Triple Alliance, much depends on the starting point. Germany, for example, in 1871 had the mere nucleus of a navy, so that she could easily increase it sixfold at a much smaller expenditure than France would incur in increasing hers by a small fraction.

Against M. Lockroy's assertion that the French naval artillery was inferior, the Minister of Marine produced English authority that the French guns and shells were better. Torpedo boats had shown defects in France, as elsewhere, yet they were still useful. The question as to reform in naval administration is obviously one of local rather than international consequence, at least in the first instance, and while defects have been shown, the appointment of a commission of investigation with such a member as M. Lockroy on it seems to indicate that reform will be secured, especially since the Government has recognized its necessity. In fact, some of the faults in the departments concerned with provisions and supplies, and some of the delays in building ships are such as have been experienced from time to time in the English service and our own. But it is only fair to say that M. Lockroy has made strong points against the French naval administration.

The point in regard to coast defences concerns the War Department rather than the navy, yet the latter has rather more to do with the subject of coast protection than under our system. It now appears that Gen. Mercier disputes all of M. Lockroy's assertions, and says that Corsica alone has 20,000 equipped men for its protection, and the entire French coast more than 200,000.

The ex-Minister of Commerce, however, was beyond question right in saying as he did in the *Eclair*, prior to his last speech in the Chamber of Deputies, that, fleet against fleet, the British could crush the French, and he has a certain ground for asserting that "our only chance is to cut off English commerce and paralyze her import and export trade." But the value of fast cruisers in that country, as in ours, does not show that battle ships are not needed, and M. Lockroy may fairly be criticised as emphasizing too much a single point, or rather underrating other points in order to give prominence to one, though that is a point of unquestioned importance. The more cruisers that France builds for attacking British commerce, the more will England construct for protecting it.

Since in the present year the expenditure for new French naval construction exceeds $10,000,000, it can hardly be charged that insufficient attention is given to strengthening the navy, and in fact the recent English alarm was based on the vigor and liberality of French preparation, combined with that of Russia. Perhaps the effect of the discussion, however, may be to increase the attention of the French to fast cruisers, in which department of construction they may perhaps have fallen relatively a little behind. M. Lockroy has shown what appears to be excessive expenditures, if not great blunders, and he has apparently performed a useful service, even if it be retorted that France is not the only country that has made mistakes or suffered from maladministration.